

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1908.

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 24 Concord Ave., Cambridge.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,163 members in 245 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN, Dean of
Radcliffe College,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON,

Vice-Presidents.

Recording Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y,
24 Concord Ave., Cambridge.

PROGRESS OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

THE REMONSTRANCE welcomes *The Anti-Suffragist*, a quarterly magazine, published at Albany and edited by Mrs. Winslow Crannell, chairman of the Albany Auxiliary of the New York Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. The first number, dated July, is full of timely articles. Not the least interesting is a statement, by counties, of the membership of the New York State Woman Suffrage Association. This shows that the whole paid membership of the Association in the state, men, women, and children, is but 3,947.

THE League for the Civic Education

of Women, affiliated with the New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, has added the following honorary vice-presidents to its list of officers:

Mrs. Sanford Bissell, Mrs. Andrew Carnegie, Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Mrs. William Perkins Draper, Mrs. George White Field, Mrs. David H. Greer, Miss Jeanette L. Gilder, Mrs. Alfred Meyer, Mrs. Paul Morton, Mrs. Henry Seligman, Mrs. Hiram W. Sibley, Miss Mary L. Stebbins, Mrs. William Haynes Truesdale, Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer and Mrs. Mabel Dean Kalbfleisch.

An advisory board, including the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, Francis S. Bangs, Richard Watson Gilder, Dr. Rossiter Johnson, and Francis Lynde Stetson, has also been formed.

The following are some of the subjects proposed for lectures to be given next winter under the auspices of the League at Berkeley Lyceum, Cooper Union, and elsewhere:

"Universal Suffrage for Women from a Man's Point of View"; "Woman Suffrage and Woman's Educational Opportunities"; "Woman Suffrage and Woman's Industrial Position"; "The Woman and the Vote"; "The Change of the Feminine Ideal"; "Woman's Work When Non-Partisan"; "The Responsibilities of the Ballot"; "Women's Legal Rights, Facts and Statistics, Etc., in New York State"; "History of Women's Suffrage and Its True Meaning"; "The Influence of the Ballot for the Wage-Earning Woman"; "Women's Opportunities and Vocations without the Ballot"; "What Anti-Suffrage Means by Statistics and Facts"; "Woman Suffrage and Woman Anti-Suffrage"; "The Abuses of the Ballot"; "The Ballot, Higher Education and the College Women"; "Qualified Suffrage"; "Woman's True Mission."

A CROWDED meeting was held in London, July 21, for the purpose of inaugurating the Woman's National Anti-Suffrage League. It was made specially noteworthy by the participation of Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lady Jersey, Lady George Hamilton, Helen Mathers, and the dowager Lady Desart. Some of the most prominent publicists in Great Britain have pledged their aid to the campaign against the agitation in favor of votes for women. Mr. Austen Chamberlain is among these, as are Lord Rothschild, Lord Ampthill, and Michael Hicks-Beach. "The Prime Minister has stated in substance," observes the London *Times*, commenting upon all this, "that if women make it clear

that they want the vote, he will give it to them." Now the *Times* professes itself firmly convinced that the great majority of the women of England do not want the franchise. "But unless they exert themselves to show that they do not want it, they will give the minority occasion to misrepresent their views." Hence the movement against woman suffrage in England, a movement which the *Times* thinks will become powerful and triumphant. The suffragists are to be fought with their own weapons. Organization will be met by organization, argument by argument, agitation by counter-agitation. The *Times* says:

When Mrs. Ward affirms that the proposed change would be a disaster for England, and first and foremost for women themselves, we are satisfied that she is expressing the view of the great bulk of English-women. Not many of them, and not many of their male relations, could state their reasons for holding this belief with the lucidity and the cogency which mark her speech, but their common sense teaches them that the decision of great political questions is best left to men, as it always has been left by every nation that has played any conspicuous part in the world. The leaders of the movement are as earnest and as deeply imbued with public spirit as the leaders of the suffragists, but they differ from them absolutely, both as to the wisdom of granting the parliamentary vote to women and as to the alleged wish of women to obtain it. The women who agree with them have to prove that they are as much in earnest as Mrs. Fawcett and her supporters, and that they can exhibit equal tenacity in pressing their wishes upon the legislature and the electorate. Lady Haversham stated at the meeting that in a single fortnight thirty-seven thousand signatures of women had been obtained to a petition against woman suffrage. That is an encouraging sign.

The real reason why women ought not to have the political franchise is the very simple reason that they are not men, and that, according to a

well-known *dictum*, even an act of Parliament cannot make them men. Men govern the world, and, so far as it is possible to foresee, they must always govern it. That necessity arises from the fact of sex. The state depends for its existence, as Mrs. Ward says, on the physical power of its citizens to defend it by force of arms, and next upon the "trained and specialized knowledge" which men alone are able to acquire.

THE OREGON DEFEAT.

THE majority against the woman suffrage amendment to the constitution of Oregon at the election last June was even larger than was reported in the June REMONSTRANCE. The official figures show 36,858 votes in favor of suffrage and 58,670 against, an adverse majority of 21,812. When the proposition was first submitted, in 1900, the suffragists carried 21 of the 33 counties in the state; last June they carried only 4, and these by such small majorities as 7, 18, 31, and 34 votes respectively.

The following comparison of the official figures in 1906 and 1908 is instructive:

	For Suffrage.	Against.	Maj. Against.
1906. . . .	36,902	47,075	10,173
1908. . . .	36,858	58,670	21,812

Two years ago the suffragists professed to believe that their defeat was largely due to the liquor interests. This year, in view of the fact that the same counties which voted against woman suffrage, voted also overwhelmingly against the saloons, where the issue was raised under the local option law, such an explanation would be preposterous. But Mrs. Duniway, who led the Oregon suffragists, writing in the *Woman's Journal* of July 4, gave the following reason:

When the returns are all in, there is no doubt that we shall have held the affirmative vote of two years ago and more. This was all we hoped to do, after we found the state reinforced by forty thousand new voters from the East, the Middle West, and South, who regarded the equal suffrage movement with the same especial horror that holds all the older states in thrall.

The official figures deprive Mrs.

Duniway of even this meager consolation, for the affirmative vote was actually less than in 1906. But, suppose that Mrs. Duniway is right and that all the new voters from the East, Middle West, and South voted against woman suffrage, where is the hope for woman suffrage in any contest in the future? Oregon, presumably, will continue to grow, and most of its citizens wish that it should. But, if all the new voters regard the woman suffrage movement with "especial horror," what are its chances?

THE ENGLISH MANIFESTO.

THERE is printed below the full text of the manifesto which was adopted at the meeting in London, July 21, held for the purpose of organizing a National Woman's Anti-Suffrage League. Existing laws and conditions in England and the United States vary, but as a statement of the essential principles which prompt thoughtful women in both countries to oppose the suffrage movement, this manifesto is of the utmost value:

1. It is time that the women who are opposed to the concession of the parliamentary franchise to women should make themselves fully and widely heard. The arguments on the other side have been put with great ability and earnestness, in season and out of season, and enforced by methods legitimate and illegitimate.

2. An Anti-Suffrage League has therefore been formed, and all women who sympathize with its objects are earnestly requested to join it.

3. The matter is urgent. Unless those who hold that the success of the woman's suffrage movement would bring disaster upon England are prepared to take immediate and effective action, judgment may go by default and our country drift towards a momentous revolution, both social and political, before it has realized the dangers involved.

4. It is sometimes said that the

concession of the franchise is "inevitable," and that a claim of this kind once started and vehemently pressed must be granted. Let those who take this view consider the case of America. A vigorous campaign in favor of women's suffrage has been carried on in the States for more than a generation. After forty years the American agitation has been practically defeated. The English agitation must be defeated in the same way by the steady work and argument of women themselves.

5. Let us state the main reasons why this league opposes the concession of the parliamentary vote to women:

(a) Because the spheres of men and women, owing to natural causes, are essentially different, and therefore their share in the management of the state should be different.

(b) Because the complex modern state depends for its very existence on naval and military power, diplomacy, finance, and the great mining, constructive, shipping, and transport industries, in none of which can women take any practical part. Yet it is upon these matters, and the vast interests involved in them, that the work of Parliament largely turns.

(c) Because by the concession of the local government vote and the admission of women to county and borough councils, the nation has opened a wide sphere of public work and influence to women, which is within their powers. To make proper use of it, however, will tax all the energies that women have to spare, apart from the care of the home and the development of the individual life.

(d) Because the influence of women in social causes will be diminished rather than increased by the possession of the parliamentary vote. At present they stand, in matters of social reform, apart from and beyond party politics, and are listened to accordingly. The legitimate influence of women in politics — in all classes, rich and poor — will always be in proportion to their education and common sense. But the deciding power of the parliamentary vote should be left to men, whose physical force is ultimately responsible for the conduct of the state.

(e) Because all the reforms which are put forward as reasons for the vote

can be obtained by other means than the vote, as is proved by the general history of the laws relating to women and children during the past century. The channels of public opinion are always freely open to women. Moreover, the services which women can with advantage render to the nation in the field of social and educational reform, and in the investigation of social problems, have been recognized by Parliament. Women have been included in royal commissions and admitted to a share in local government. The true path of progress seems to lie in further development along these lines. Representative women, for instance, might be brought into closer consultative relation with government departments in matters where the special interests of women are concerned.

(f) Because any measure for the enfranchisement of women must either (1) concede the vote to women on the same terms as to men and thereby in practice involve an unjust and invidious limitation; or (2) by giving the vote to wives of voters tend to the introduction of political differences into domestic life; or (3) by the adoption of adult suffrage, which seems the inevitable result of admitting the principle, place the female vote in an overpowering majority.

(g) Because, finally, the danger which might arise from the concession of woman suffrage, in the case of a state burdened with such complex and far-reaching responsibilities as England, is out of all proportion to the risk run by those smaller communities which have adopted it. The admission to full political power of a number of voters debarred by nature and circumstance from the average political knowledge and experience open to men, would weaken the central governing forces of the state, and be fraught with peril to the country. Women who hold these views must now organize in their support.

6. We appeal, therefore, to those who disapprove the present suffrage agitation to join our league and to support it by every means in their power.

The woman suffrage movement can be defeated — it must be defeated — and by women themselves.

Women of England! We appeal to your patriotism and your common sense.

A CHANGE OF FRONT IN OREGON.

THE suffragists in Oregon have made a significant change of front. It is announced in the *Woman's Journal* of September 12 that the form of a suffrage amendment decided on to be submitted to a referendum vote in 1910 contains only the following clause:

"It is expressly provided that no citizen who is a taxpayer shall be denied the right to vote on account of sex."

This change of policy goes to show that the suffrage leaders despair of success in persuading the voters of Oregon to grant full suffrage to women on the same conditions as to men. If they saw any hope of securing the ballot for all women, they would not narrow their demand to a proposal to confer it only upon taxpaying women. Even in the East, taxpaying women are but a small minority of their sex. In a comparatively new state like Oregon, they must be a mere handful, by comparison with the total number of women of voting age.

It is explained that the reason for this change of policy is that "so many objections were urged at the last election against 'irresponsible voting' as the reason given by business men for voting against suffrage for women" that the suffragists have now decided to ask for what they call the "one step at a time" plan at the next election. This, of course, serves notice upon the voters that taxpaying suffrage for women, even if sanctioned by the referendum, is not to be a finality, but only a preliminary to a fresh appeal for universal woman suffrage. Oregon voters, business men and others who have been moved by the "irresponsible voting" objection to vote against woman suffrage are not likely to be deceived or conciliated by a policy which merely postpones "irresponsible voting" for a while, and in the meantime asks them to be so kind as to assist in driving in the entering wedge which is to open the way for it.

But, under these conditions, what is to become of the old arguments, which demanded the ballot as a means of improving the status of women wage-earners? What is likely to be the attitude of labor-unionists toward a proposition which looks to an aristocracy of the ballot and tends to add to the voting strength of rich men the votes of their wives and their sisters and cousins and aunts? Will it be any consolation to them to be told that the turn of women at large, mere women who do not pay taxes, may come after a while, if the taxpaying women are first given a vote?

The proposal which the Oregon suffragists have adopted as a forlorn hope is wholly at variance with democratic institutions. It is alien to America. It has never been given the slightest encouragement by any legislature in the United States. Here and there a law has been enacted under which bonding propositions or other measures involving the expenditure of money have been submitted to the approval of taxpayers, women as well as men. But no legislature has ever yet framed a law or sanctioned a constitutional amendment under which women with means, payers of taxes, were treated as a class by themselves and given the full ballot, which was denied to their less fortunate sisters. The notion that the right to vote should, in the case of men, rest upon the possession of property or even upon the payment of a poll tax has been abandoned. It is little likely to be adopted with reference to women.

BOMBS NEXT TIME.

[Cable dispatch in the *New York Evening Post*.]

LONDON, July 1. — The extraordinary demonstration last night before the houses of Parliament made by the women suffragists in their effort to secure votes for themselves had a rather startling sequel to-day, when one of the women, Mary Leigh, arrested for breaking windows in the house of the premier, Mr. Asquith, declared in the Bow Street police court that "the next time we come out you can expect bombs."

This radical statement has had the effect of drawing a greater degree of attention to the entire suffragist movement in England, and the police will henceforward have to handle the women demonstrators with less of good-humored tolerance and more severity. This threat by Mary Leigh, which was a repetition of what she said at the time she was taken into custody, is really the sensation of the last demonstration, for the much-heralded attack on the House of Commons last night was a comparative failure. Nothing like the expected number of suffragists appeared, and the movement was lacking in definite organization.

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD'S LONDON SPEECH.

THE REMONSTRANCE makes no apology for giving so large a part of the present number to the anti-suffrage movement in England. That movement is fortunate in its leadership, and it is extending with a rapidity which promises to demonstrate beyond doubt that the great majority of women in England, as in the United States, do not wish the ballot.

Following are extracts from the speech made by Mrs. Humphry Ward at the great London meeting for the organization of the Anti-Suffrage League:

Let us, then, meet energy with energy, and in a spirit of hope. There is nothing in this movement which cannot be defeated, as this manifesto points out. I have ventured lately to draw English attention to the state of things in America, where, after half a century of agitation, the woman suffrage movement is obviously declining, put down by the common sense of women themselves. They certainly could have got it if they had ultimately determined upon it; and in the sixties and seventies, when women's clubs were spreading all over the States, with the avowed object of securing woman suffrage, when great meetings were perpetually being held and petitions presented to the state legislatures or to Congress, it looked as though the movement would and must succeed. Four states had granted suffrage; other states were being pressed to grant it. Then, in the eighties, the tide turned. The opinion of women themselves set against it. Women's anti-suffrage societies sprang up, led in many cases by the women most actively concerned in social and philanthropic work; appeals to state legislatures were met by counter-appeals, ably argued; a vast amount of literature was distributed; and now not even Mrs. Cobden Sanderson can deny that the movement is receding, or, as Mrs. Fawcett prefers to put it, is "less advanced" than in England. Mr. Zangwill, indeed, announces that he is "bored" by facts drawn from Wyoming and Oregon. But I am afraid this is only when they are used against him! The society for which he writes is never tired of quoting the four suffrage states when it suits them to do so, and of printing a number of highly doubtful statements about them. One

of their recent pamphlets deals entirely with the noble example of Wyoming and Colorado, Utah and Idaho. But when some one points out that there is a great deal to be said of another kind about these four states, and that the state of Oregon, which has for neighbors these very suffrage states, has just defeated a woman's suffrage amendment by 20,000 votes, as against 10,000 last time, and 1,800 the time before, then Mr. Zangwill is "bored."

We must fight, then, and fight with hope.

Two arguments often used in the controversy are not touched in the manifesto, which had, of necessity, to be short. But they have had remarkable influence upon the working population of the north. I mean (1) the argument that the possession of the vote would raise the wages of women to an equality with those of men; (2) that hygienic regulation of the employment of women — married women especially — should not be imposed on women without their consent, expressed through the vote.

Heavy, indeed, is the responsibility of those who are teaching an excitable factory population that the possession of a vote will raise their wages! If this were even remotely true, would the average wage of the agricultural laborer, twenty-four years after his political enfranchisement, be still 15s. or 16s. a week? Would all that mass of low-paid male labor disclosed by Mr. Rowntree's book on York, or Mr. Booth's "London," still exist if the vote could remedy it?

The reasons why women's wage is generally lower than that of men are partly economic, partly physical. There are more women than men; men are stronger than women; there is far more competition for men's labor; marriage and the expectation of marriage affect the industrial value of women's work unfavorably; and, above all, the organization of women's labor is still backward and weak.

Many causes now in operation will, we hope, tend in time to the better payment of women; the more even spread of the world's population, better training, better organization, and so on. But to teach the laboring women of England that a parliamentary vote is of itself to raise wages and bring them the economic millennium, is, as it seems to me, to poison the wells of thought and action among them, and to increase instead of lightening the burdens on our sex.

As to factory regulations, the opinion of women in the matter, trained and experienced women, has been of increasing importance with the government for many years past. I believe I am not wrong in saying that a very large proportion of the recent reforms in factory legislation for women and children are due to the reports of women inspectors, in daily contact with the people, and bringing their trained knowledge to bear. But let us ask a further question, Is the work of married women in factories the concern only of women? Not at all. It is the concern of the nation as a whole, who are the trustees for and the guardians of the coming generation.

SLIGHT HEADWAY.

THE London Express published July 20 the result of a poll of its readers on the question of woman suffrage. The figures showed 13,316 men and 37,962 women in favor of woman suffrage, and 60,047 men and 49,942 women opposed. No such newspaper poll is conclusive, but these figures at least suggest that the noisy suffragette campaign in England has made little real headway among either men or women.

A PLAINTIVE ADMISSION.

[From Ida Husted Harper's report of the International Woman Suffrage Congress at Amsterdam, in the New York Sun, June 21, 1908.]

WHAT report can be offered by the delegates from the United States, to whom the whole world looks for leadership in progressive movements? Simply this, that the Anti-Suffrage Association has opened headquarters in New York and will be addressed by leading members of Congress and the cabinet of President Roosevelt. We sit in sackcloth with ashes on our head.

PRESS COMMENTS.

Barmaids in Line.

[From the Boston Evening Record, June 15, 1908.]

THE cause of woman suffrage in England grows in intense picturesqueness, if not in realization of voting power. In the parade of 20,000 suffragettes a banner bearing the portrait of our Susan B. Anthony was conspicuous, as were also 3,000 barmaids in line.

No Results of Woman Suffrage in Colorado.

[From the Denver, Colo., Republican, July 2, 1908.]

EXPERIENCE teaches that equality of suffrage does little more than increase the number of votes cast. In Colorado no evidence of different results has been seen in consequence of the enfranchisement of women.